



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,649	12/26/2001	Russell Joseph Brumm	16,695	9547
23556	7590	07/07/2006	EXAMINER	
KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC. 401 NORTH LAKE STREET NEENAH, WI 54956				SINGH, RACHNA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2176		

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,649	BRUMM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachna Singh	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 and 35-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/21/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is responsive to communications: Response to Restriction Requirement filed on 04/19/06.

2. Claims 1-39 are pending. Claims 24-34 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 35 are independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-23 and 35-39 in the reply filed on 04/19/06 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07/21/05 has been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 04/11/02 are accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-17, 19-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dusevic et al., US 2002/0055868 A1, May 9, 2002 (filed on 05/22/01, non-provisional filed on 05/24/00).

In reference to claim 1, Dusevic teaches a task-centric online environment to control process flow which is equivalent to ***a process control method***. See page 1, paragraph [0005]-[0008]. Dusevic discloses the following:

- Providing a task-centric view of a task or a problem that the user desires to solve.

The task-centric view represents the tasks and subtasks of a process which is equivalent to the claimed ***retrieving a stored electronic map associated with a process to be performed***. See page 1, paragraph [0008].

EXAMINER NOTE : The claimed electronic map is equivalent to a task-based model.

- Allowing the user to navigate through the processes according to a task-based model which is equivalent to the claimed ***performing tasks of the process while following the electronic map.*** See page 1, paragraph [0008] and page 4, paragraphs [0045]-[0050].
- Associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The content can be online reference manuals, white papers, and other sources. These documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually, graphically, as video and as sound. The document is accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page which is equivalent to the claimed ***while performing the tasks, accessing stored information from files external to the electronic map and associated with the process by actuating a graphical item of the display device with a pointing device.*** See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

In reference to claim 2, Dusevic teaches clicking on a link displayed on a display device and retrieving a file, web page, or another location on the page to be presented to a user which is equivalent to the claimed ***clicking a hyperlink displayed on a***

display device; retrieving a file stored at a location indicated by the hyperlink; presenting user information on the display device using the retrieved file. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

In reference to claim 3, Dusevic teaches associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The documents are accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page documents. The documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including sound which is equivalent to the claimed ***retrieving a stored electronic audio file for use in association with performing the tasks of the process.*** See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

EXAMINER NOTE: a document in the form of sound is equivalent to an audio file.

In reference to claim 4, Dusevic teaches associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The documents are accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page documents. The documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including video which is equivalent to the claimed ***retrieving a stored electronic video file for use in association with performing the tasks of the process.*** See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

In reference to claim 5, Dusevic teaches associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The documents are accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page documents. These documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually, graphically, as video and as sound which is equivalent to the claimed ***retrieving a stored electronic document for use in association with performing the tasks of the process.*** See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

In reference to claim 6, Dusevic teaches associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The documents are accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page documents. These documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually, graphically, as video and as sound. The documents may be information regarding solution documents from support, white papers, recommended micro-tasks and other sources. The documents may provide an item that specifies the particular individual task represented in the task page. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077]. This is equivalent to the claimed ***retrieving one or more documents containing information required for a task of the process.***

In reference to claim 7, Dusevic teaches documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually, graphically, as video and as sound. The documents may be information regarding solution documents from support, white papers, recommended micro-tasks and other sources. The documents may provide an item that specifies the particular individual task represented in the task page. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077].

In reference to claim 8, Dusevic teaches retrieving documents that may include information that is presented in one or more various forms including sound. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3. Dusevic further teaches that the information retrieved could be related to training information and tutorials. See page 1, paragraph [0008] and page 12, paragraph [0319].

In reference to claim 9, Dusevic teaches the documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually and as sound. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

In reference to claim 10, Dusevic teaches retrieving user input and operating on the input items as shown in the task model. A user can select the type of information they wish to view. See page 16, paragraphs [0363]-[0364].

In reference to claim 11, Dusevic teaches retrieving a document. Categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) of the task model are associated with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The content can be online reference manuals, white papers, and other sources.

In reference to claim 12, Dusevic teaches retrieving user input and operating on the input items as shown in the task model. A user can select the type of information they wish to view. See page 16, paragraphs [0363]-[0364].

In reference to claim 13, Dusevic teaches retrieving a document. Categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) of the task model are associated with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The content can be online reference manuals, white papers, and other sources.

In reference to claims 14-17 and 19, Dusevic teaches using a task-centric view of a task in order to solve the task or problem. This entails producing a result. The result can be presented at a content level in the form of a document, file, or web page. See page 6, paragraphs [0067]-[0072].

In reference to claim 20, Dusevic teaches using a browser application or a display that displays web pages. Dusevic discloses associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The

content can be online reference manuals, white papers, and other sources. These documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually, graphically, as video and as sound. The document is accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

In reference to claim 23, Dusevic teaches providing a task-centric view of a task or a problem that the user desires to solve. The task-centric view represents the tasks and subtasks of a process. See page 1, paragraph [0008]. EXAMINER NOTE : The claimed electronic map is equivalent to a task-based model. Allowing the user to navigate through the processes according to a task-based model. See page 1, paragraph [0008] and page 4, paragraphs [0045]-[0050].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 21-22 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dusevic et al., US 2002/0055868 A1, May 9, 2002 (filed on 05/22/01, non-provisional filed on 05/24/00) in view of Frank et al., US 2002/0143595 A1, 10/03/02 (filed 02/05/01).

In reference to claims 21-22, Dusevic teaches allowing a user to click on a hyperlink associated with a task or subtask in order to retrieve more information about the task via a document, file, or website. The website can contain more information about the task such as information about regulatory significance. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

Dusevic does not expressly state the link is a regulatory flag hyperlink linking to a regulatory agency web site or that the information is about regulatory significance of the task.

Frank teaches a method and system for compliance management including workflow management components. The workflow system interacts with an incident management system. The workflow system allows a user to define business processes for compliance management. A business process is a group of logically related tasks that use resources of an organization to provide results in support of the organization's compliance objects. The workflow system executes the business processes while monitoring performance and cost to determine compliance with certain regulations which is the same as the claimed ***regulatory significance of the task***. See page 4, paragraphs [0038]-[0040].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Dusevic's task centric process model and Frank's regulatory significance records of a workflow defining business process tasks because it was desirable to provide a compliance system which regulated business programs to ensure companies were demonstrating compliance with the increasing number of regulatory requirements. Furthermore, it was desirable to keep a record of the incident and events that lead up to an incident in order to prevent future regulatory violations as it was difficult to do so with written compliance programs. See page 1, paragraphs [0004]-[0009] of Frank.

In reference to claim 35, Dusevic teaches a task-centric online environment to control process flow which is equivalent to **a process control method**. See page 1, paragraph [0005]-[0008]. Dusevic discloses the following:

- Providing a task-centric view of a task or a problem that the user desires to solve. The task-centric view represents the tasks and subtasks of a process which is equivalent to the claimed **activating a visual electronic map on a display device**. See page 1, paragraph [0008]. EXAMINER NOTE : The claimed electronic map is equivalent to a task-based model.
- Retrieving information related to training information and tutorials which is equivalent to the claimed **training a user using training information**

electronically linked to the electronic map. See page 1, paragraph [0008] and page 12, paragraph [0319].

- Allowing the user to navigate through the processes according to a task-based model. The tasks may be related to production areas of the oil and gas industry and the task model assists users in performing tasks which is equivalent to the claimed ***performing steps of the business process in conjunction with defined tasks and task ordering of the electronic map.*** See page 1, paragraph [0008], page 4, paragraphs [0045]-[0050], and page 16, paragraphs [0366] - end.
- Associating categories (i.e. tasks and sub-tasks) with one or more content documents. See page 5, paragraph [0058]. The content can be online reference manuals, white papers, and other sources. These documents may include information that may be presented in one or more various forms including textually, graphically, as video and as sound. The document is accessed using a link that can be selected by a user with a mouse or in some other fashion, resulting in the delivery and view of another object such as a file or web page which is equivalent to the claimed ***when required, electronically accessing additional information by linking to the additional information from the electronic map.*** See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

Dusevic does not teach the claimed ***upon completion of the business process producing a regulatory record of compliance with regulations.*** Frank teaches a

method and system for compliance management including workflow management components. The workflow system interacts with an incident management system. The workflow system allows a user to define business processes for compliance management. A business process is a group of logically related tasks that use resources of an organization to provide results in support of the organization's compliance objects. The workflow system executes the business processes while monitoring performance and cost to determine compliance with certain regulations which is the same as the claimed ***upon completion of the business process producing a regulatory record of compliance with regulations.*** See page 4, paragraphs [0038]-[0040].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Dusevic's task centric process model and Frank's compliance management of a workflow defining business process tasks because it was desirable to provide a compliance system which regulated business programs to ensure companies were demonstrating compliance with the increasing number of regulatory requirements. Furthermore, it was desirable to keep a record of the incident and events that lead up to an incident in order to prevent future regulatory violations as it was difficult to do so with written compliance programs. See page 1, paragraphs [0004]-[0009] of Frank.

In reference to claim 36, Dusevic does not teach verifying a training status of the user before providing access to one or more tasks of the electronic map; however, Frank teaches developing customized training for a user based on the need or

deficiencies identified by the workflow system. Frank teaches tracking the status of employee compliance activity to determine what training is needed. See page 2, paragraph [0023], page 4, paragraph [0040], and page 5, paragraph [0049]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frank's verification of the training status of a user accessing a task process model such as that of Dusevic's because it was desirable to provide a training to users who had regulatory violations in order to prevent future regulatory violations. See page 1, paragraphs [0004]-[0009] of Frank.

In reference to claim 37, Dusevic teaches providing training; however, he does not teach assessing a user's qualification before providing access to one or more tasks of the electronic map. Frank teaches creating customized training programs for a user which are specific to the employee function. An employee's function is used to determine the type of training the user needs. See page 2, paragraph [0023]-page 4, paragraph [0040]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frank's assessment of a user's qualifications before providing access to a task process model such as that of Dusevic's because it was desirable to provide appropriate training to users who had previous regulatory violations in order to prevent future regulatory violations. See page 1, paragraphs [0004]-[0009] of Frank.

In reference to claim 38, Dusevic does not teach comparing a user's training history with the training requirements; however, Frank teaches developing customized training for a user based on the need or deficiencies identified by the workflow system. Frank teaches tracking the status of employee compliance activity to determine what training is needed. See page 2, paragraph [0023], page 4, paragraph [0040], and page 5, paragraph [0049]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frank's comparison of training received against the training required of a user accessing a task process model such as that of Dusevic's because it was desirable to provide a training to users who had regulatory violations in order to prevent future regulatory violations. See page 1, paragraphs [0004]-[0009] of Frank.

In reference to claim 39, Dusevic does not teach providing regulatory flag for tasks having a regulatory impact in the business process. Dusevic teaches allowing a user to click on a hyperlink associated with a task or subtask in order to retrieve more information about the task via a document, file, or website. The website can contain more information about the task such as information about regulatory significance. See pages 6-7, paragraphs [0072]-[0077] and figure 3.

Frank teaches a method and system for compliance management including workflow management components. The workflow system interacts with an incident management system. The workflow system allows a user to define business processes for compliance management. A business process is a group of logically related tasks

that use resources of an organization to provide results in support of the organization's compliance objects. The workflow system executes the business processes while monitoring performance and cost to determine compliance with certain regulations which is the same as the claimed ***regulatory significance of the task***. See page 4, paragraphs [0038]-[0040].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Dusevic's task centric process model and Frank's regulatory significance records of a workflow defining business process tasks because it was desirable to provide a compliance system which regulated business programs to ensure companies were demonstrating compliance with the increasing number of regulatory requirements. Furthermore, it was desirable to keep a record of the incident and events that lead up to an incident in order to prevent future regulatory violations as it was difficult to do so with written compliance programs. See page 1, paragraphs [0004]-[0009] of Frank.

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dusevic et al., US 2002/0055868 A1, May 9, 2002 (filed on 05/22/01, non-provisional filed on 05/24/00) in view of

In reference to claim 18, Dusevic does not teach that producing one or more output items comprises actuating a feedback button of the electronic map to communicate task information to a map maintainer. Davies teaches a system and

method for defining a process structure for performing a task. Davies teaches reviewing the task model in detail, the options menu item has a feedback button which when selected, allows the option of either detailed or general feedback on the task model. See column 12, lines 33-42. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Davies' feedback button to produce output items in the task model system of Dusevic because it provides a more detailed view of a diagnostic on the task model. See column 12, lines 33-44.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kahn et al. US 2003/0065669 A1

Cotter et al. US 2003/0069894 A1

Gimbert et al. US 2002/0116620 A1

Rosnow et al. US 2003/0106039 A1

Pronsati, Jr. et al. US 6,678,716 B1

Ivanov US 5,706,452

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RS
06/27/06

Heather Herndon
HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100